

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

In re Application of : Customer Number: 46320  
Scott CARRIER : Confirmation Number: 9171  
Application No.: 10/712,544 : Group Art Unit: 2178  
Filed: November 13, 2003 : Examiner: M. Patel  
For: LIGHTWEIGHT FORM PATTERN VALIDATION

**REPLY BRIEF**

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents  
Commissioner For Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This Reply Brief is submitted under 37 C.F.R. § 41.41 in response to the EXAMINER'S ANSWER dated July 24, 2008.

The Examiner's response to Appellant's arguments submitted in the Second Appeal Brief of April 25, 2008 (hereinafter the Second Appeal Brief), raises additional issues and underscores the factual and legal shortcomings in the Examiner's rejection. In response, Appellant relies upon the arguments presented in the Second Appeal Brief and the arguments set forth below.

**REMARKS**

REMARKS

On page 7 of the Second Appeal Brief, Appellant pointed out where the Examiner's Answer is required to include particular content discussed in M.P.E.P. § 1207.02, yet the Examiner has completely ignored this requirement. As noted throughout the prosecution of this application and in the Appeal Brief, the Examiner has failed to properly establish the facts underlying the Examiner's analysis. As noted in the paragraph spanning pages 8 and 9 of the Second Appeal Brief, Appellant's position is that these omissions in the Examiner's prima facie analysis are correctable by the Examiner, and the correction of these omissions would help both Appellant and the Honorable Board gain a better understanding of the underlying facts and analysis employed by the Examiner in rejecting the claims. Appellant, therefore, respectfully recommends that the Honorable Board remand the present application to the Examiner to address these omissions.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101

16 The Examiner's response to the arguments presented on pages 5 and 6 of the Second  
17 Appeal Brief is found on page 10 of the Examiner's Answer and reproduced below:

18 The Examiner Respectfully Disagrees: Contrary to arguments made by Appellant, use of the word  
19 "system" does not inherently mean that the claim is directed to a machine. Only if at least one of  
20 the claimed elements of the system is a physical part of a device can the system constitute part of a  
21 device or a combination of devices to be a machine within the meaning of 101. A validation  
22 processor is not an actual hardware element; instead it describes software per se thus failing to fall  
23 within the statutory category of invention because it fails to be tangibly embodied in a computer  
24 readable medium to be used by anything including "a client device". (emphasis added)  
25  
26 Referring to the underlined portions of the above-reproduced passage, the Examiner's analysis  
27 reflects a failure to properly consider the meaning of the phrase "software per se." The definition

1 of the legal term "per se" is the following:<sup>1</sup>

2 By itself; in itself; taken alone; by means of itself; through itself; inherently; in isolation;  
3 unconnected with other matters; simply as such; in its own natures without reference to its  
4 relation.

5  
6 Thus, by definition, software *per se* is software, by itself, unconnected from anything else (e.g.,  
7 hardware). Thus, software *per se* is either an abstract idea or functional descriptive material (i.e.,  
8 a description of the software written on a piece of paper). In either instance, software *per se* does  
9 not lead to a useful, concrete, and tangible result and is deemed to be non-statutory subject  
10 matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

11  
12 However, the claimed invention, as recited in claim 1, is not directed to software *per se*.  
13 For example, claim 1 recites "a validation processor ... configured with a prototype interface for  
14 receiving ..." It is not possible for abstract ideas or functional descriptive material to be  
15 "configured," or to have an "interface for receiving." Neither abstract ideas nor functional  
16 descriptive material are capable of being configured or are capable of receiving. Instead, these  
17 capabilities/functionalities are found in a device, which is the ordinary and customary meaning  
18 attributed to the term "processor" by one having ordinary skill in the art.

19  
20 Similarly, claim 1 recites "input field *programmed for validation* using said validation  
21 processor." It is impossible for either an abstract idea or functional descriptive material to be  
22 programmed to validate a field. Abstract ideas are incapable of being programmed because  
23 abstract ideas, by definition, are ideas without form or substance. Functional descriptive material  
24 (e.g., a piece of paper upon which program code is written) is also entirely incapable of being  
25 programmed. On the contrary, one skilled in the art would look only to computer hardware as

---

<sup>1</sup> Black's Law Dictionary 1142 (6th ed. 1990).

1 being programmed. Thus, one skilled in the art would *never* consider the subject matter  
2 encompassed by the claims to be directed to "software per se."

3

4 The Examiner's assertion that "it fails to be tangibly embodied in a computer readable  
5 medium" appears to better suited as an enablement rejection under the first paragraph of 35  
6 U.S.C. § 112. However, enablement rejections do *not* apply to claims.

7

8

---

9 On page 11 of the Examiner's Answer, the Examiner reproduced two arguments from the  
10 Second Appeal Brief. The Examiner then asserted the following on page 11 of the Examiner's  
11 Answer:

12 The Examiner Respectfully Disagrees: The Final office action dated 1/25/2008 has  
13 rejected all pending claims and further provided an explanation with citations for all the rejections  
14 of each claim as support. Furthermore it has been cited in numerous actions that the teachings of a  
15 reference are not limited to specific portions, the reference as a whole must be considered by the  
16 appellant. Nonetheless appellant as decided to attack the format/structure used by the examiner to  
17 reject the claimed subject matter instead of the underlying rejection itself. Appellant has failed to  
18 "clearly designate" which limitations are disagreed upon to disprove the teachings nor show any  
19 evidence regarding the differences between the claimed subject matter and the cited references.  
20 The Examiner will provide a mapping to each limitation of Independent claim 1 using the previous  
21 explanations to assist the Appellant.

22 This passage by the Examiner reflects a fundamental understanding by the Examiner as to the  
23 Examiner responsibility in establishing a *prima facie* case of unpatentability.

25

26 The Examiner's implied reference to M.P.E.P. § 2123 (i.e., "a reference are not limited to  
27 specific portions, the reference as a whole must be considered") is misplaced. The fact that  
28 references are "relevant for all they contain" does not abrogate the Examiner from the  
29 responsibility of providing substantial evidence to support the findings of fact underlying the

1 Examiner's analysis. Appellant presented similar comments on page 13 of the Second Appeal  
2 Brief, to which the Examiner did not respond.

3

4 Appellant's "attack" on the "format/structure used by the examiner" goes to the how the  
5 Examiner establishes a prima facie case of unpatentability. The Examiner cannot properly assert  
6 that claim X is rejected based upon reference A without any analysis. However, this is very  
7 comparable to the Examiner's analysis. Appellant, time and time again, has been left to guess as  
8 to both how the Examiner is construing the language of the claims and as to how the Examiner is  
9 specifically applying the prior art. For example, Appellant cannot point out errors in the  
10 Examiner's claim construction when the Examiner does not explicitly set forth any claim  
11 constructions.

12

13 Similarly, Appellant cannot argue that feature F does not disclose claimed limitation C  
14 when the Examiner does not identify feature F as allegedly corresponding to limitation C.  
15 Before Appellant can "clearly designate" which limitation are disagreed upon to disprove the  
16 teachings," the Examiner must first clearly explain the Examiner's analysis. Notwithstanding a  
17 dearth of analysis by the Examiner, Appellant has, in fact, made arguments as to specific  
18 limitations within both within the Second Appeal Brief and prior to the filing of the Second  
19 Appeal Brief.

20

21 On pages 12 and 13 of the Examiner's Answer, the Examiner attempted to "provide a  
22 mapping to each limitation of Independent claim 1." However, the Examiner's attempt is

1 severely lacking as the Examiner does not appear to recognize that "each limitation" does not  
2 refer entire passages of the claim.

3

4 For example, page 12, lines 1-7 of the Examiner's Answer are simply word-for-word  
5 reproduction of certain limitations recited in claim 1, for which the Examiner cites, in line 8 on  
6 page 12 of the Examiner's Answer, "abstract, fig 3, fig 6, fig 8, paragraphs 5-8, 9-12, 40-41 &  
7 appendix A" as teaching.

8

9 Referring to lines page 12, lines 7-15 of the Examiner's Answer, this passage is  
10 essentially identical to the passage found in lines 13-19 on page 3 of the Fifth Office Action and  
11 the passage found in lines 3-11 on page 5 of the Examiner's Answer. As such, the Examiner has  
12 simply reproduced what the Examiner has already written.

13

14 Referring to page 12, line 21 through page 13, line 1 of the Examiner's Answer, this  
15 passage is essential identical to the passage found in lines 19-21 on page 3 of the Fifth Office  
16 Action and the passage found in lines 11-14 on page 5 of the Examiner's Answer

17

18 Referring to lines 8-16 on page 13 of the Examiner's Answer, this passage is essentially  
19 identical to the passage found in lines 21-27 on page 3 of the Fifth Office Action and the passage  
20 found in page 5, line 14 through page 6, line 2 of the Examiner's Answer. As such, the Examiner  
21 has, yet again, simply reproduced what the Examiner has already written.

22

1       With the exception of page 12, lines 16-21 and page 13, line 2-8 of the Examiner's  
2       Answer, the Examiner's alleged "mapping" is little more than a nearly word-for-word  
3       reproduction as to what the Examiner has already written in the statements of the rejection in  
4       both the Fifth Office Action and the Examiner's Answer.

5

6       The Examiner's new analysis found in page 12, lines 16-21 and page 13, line 2-8 of the  
7       Examiner's Answer is apparently in response to the arguments presented in the first full  
8       paragraph on page 12 of the Second Appeal Brief, in which Appellant argued that the Examiner  
9       failed to address the limitations of the dependent claims that were introduced into claim 1 in the  
10      Amendment dated October 30, 2007.

11

12       Specifically, referring to page 12, lines 16-21 of the Examiner's Answer, the Examiner  
13      presented the following new analysis:

14       Dziejma discloses a function call to said validation processor further disposed in said markup, said  
15       function call having a configuration for passing a reference to a value in said at least one form  
16       based input field for validation in said validation processor (appendix A, Dziejma discloses several  
17       function calls for the form validation engine within the markup document thereby passing  
18       reference values to the input field for validation by the FVE). (emphasis in original)

19  
20      The Examiner presents a conclusory statement that lacks factual support. The underlined  
21      portions of the above-reproduced passage are word-for-word reproductions of the claim  
22      limitations and the Examiner's analysis simply refers to Appendix A and repeats the language of  
23      the claim by asserting that Dziejma teaches these limitations. As such, the Examiner has, yet  
24      again, forced Appellant to guess as to how the Examiner is interpreting the language of the  
25      claims and what specific teachings in Sokolov the Examiner is relying upon to teach the specific  
26      claimed limitations.

27

1 Referring to page 13, line 2-8 of the Examiner's Answer, the Examiner presented the  
2 following additional new analysis:

3 However Sokolov explicitly teaches a library reference to said script library disposed in said  
4 markup (see abstract & column 21, Sokolov discloses a plurality of additional function calls to  
5 said validation processor disposed in said markup, each additional one of said functional calls  
6 having a configuration for passing a reference to a value in a corresponding form based input field  
7 for validation in said validation processor, and a validation shell function encapsulating said  
8 function calls (see abstract & column 21 (emphasis in original)

9  
10 Yet again, the Examiner presents a conclusory statement that lacks factual support. The  
11 underlined portions of the above-reproduced passage are word-for-word reproductions of the  
12 claim limitations. As such, the only analysis presented by the Examiner is to assert that all of  
13 these limitations are disclosed in the Abstract and column 21 of Sokolov.

14  
15 Notwithstanding that Appellant has been forced to guess as to the rationales underlying  
16 the Examiner's analysis, the limitations at issue references the validation processor, which, as  
17 claimed, validates a form based input against a field validation pattern. The Examiner's cited  
18 passages within Sokolov, however, do not refer to a validation processor. Although Sokolov  
19 refers to validation, this type of validation is entirely different than that performed by the claimed  
20 validation processor. Instead, the validation referred to by Sokolov refers to "validating that the  
21 one or more script language instructions conform to script language syntax" (see claim 5; column  
22 2, lines 19-23; column 3, lines 28-30 of Sokolov). Thus, even if Dziejma were modified in view  
23 of Sokolov, the claimed invention would not result since Sokolov fails to teach the limitations for  
24 which the Examiner is relying upon Sokolov to teach.

25  
26

---

27 In response to arguments presented on pages 9-12 of the Second Appeal Brief as to the  
28 Examiner's burden in establishing the underlying findings of fact supporting the Examiner's

1 analysis and the Examiner's failure to identify, within the '590 Provisional, the subject matter that  
2 supports the Examiner's analysis, the Examiner asserted the following on page 14 of the  
3 Examiner's Answer:

4 The Examiner Respectfully Disagrees: The Examiner has already presented a prima facie case of  
5 obviousness and designated, as nearly as practicable, the particular part being relied upon in the  
6 rejection by using specific citations of the '218 application. Furthermore the examiner prior to  
7 using the provisional date relied upon in the '590 application has already reviewed and determined  
8 that "the provisional application properly supports the subject matter relied upon...". Once again  
9 the Appellant has failed to **clearly designate** or specifically show which portions used in the  
10 rejection are not supported in the '590 provisional application, despite having access to Public  
11 Pair. Nonetheless the Examiner will provide the appropriate mappings between the subject matter  
12 of the '218 and '590 applications to assist both the Board and the Appellant. (emphasis in  
13 original)

14  
15 The above-reproduced comments again evidence the Examiner's failure to recognize that the  
16 initial burden of establishing a prima facie case rests with the Examiner. Moreover, the  
17 Examiner's "belief" that "the provisional application properly supports the subject matter relied  
18 upon" does not constitute substantial evidence.

19  
20 On pages 14 and 15 of the Examiner's Answer, the Examiner allegedly "[provided]  
21 mappings between the subject matter of the '218 and the '590 applications to assist both the  
22 Board and the Appellant." Appellant has reviewed the Examiner's "mapping," and Appellant's  
23 position is that this mapping is entirely deficient. Although the Examiner asserts that the  
24 following sections were relied upon: "abstract, fig 3, fig 6, fig 8, paragraphs 5-8, 9-12, 40-41 &  
25 appendix A," the Examiner did not specifically identify where these sections are supported in the  
26 '590 Provisional. More importantly, the Examiner did not identify where the specific teachings  
27 being relied upon to reject the claims are supported in the '590 Provisional. Instead, the  
28 Examiner generalized the teachings of Dziejma and then generally asserted where these  
29 teachings around found in the '590 Provisional. As will be described in further detail below,

1 much of the drawings and paragraphs relied upon by the Examiner do not find explicit support in  
2 the '590 Provisional.

3

4 Of Figures 3, 6, & 8 in Dziejma, the text in Figs. 2-4 of the '590 Provisional possibly  
5 provides explicit support for Fig. 8 of Dziejma.

6

7 Referring to paragraphs 5-8 of Dziejma, there are no comparable passages in the '590  
8 Provisional.

9

10 Referring to paragraphs 9-12, which are found in the "Summary of the Invention Portion"  
11 of Dziejma and constitute nearly 1 ½ columns of text, the Summary of the Invention section of  
12 '590 only includes 9 lines of text. As such, paragraphs 9-12 are not completely supported by the  
13 teachings in the '590 Provisional.

14

15 Referring to the respective Abstracts, the Abstract in Dziejma is 18 lines long whereas  
16 the Abstract in the '590 Provisional is only 4 lines long. As such, the Abstract is not completely  
17 supported by the teachings in the '590 Provisional.

18

19 Referring to the "Detailed Description of the Invention" of the '590 Provisional, which  
20 constitutes the remaining portion (i.e., pages 2-8) of the teachings in the '590 Provisional, lines  
21 10-26 on page 2 partially support paragraph [0023] of the Dziejma. Page 2, line 28 through page  
22 3, line 6 of the '590 Provisional support paragraphs [0025] and [0037]-[0039] of Dziejma. Also,  
23 page 3, lines 8-18 of the '590 Provisional support paragraphs [0026]-[0036] of Dziejma. Finally,

1 pages 4-8 of the '590 Provisional support Appendix A. Notably, paragraphs [0040], [0041] of  
2 Dziejma are not explicitly supported by the '590 Provisional.

3

4 Therefore, out of the "abstract, fig 3, fig 6, fig 8, paragraphs 5-8, 9-12, 40-41 & appendix  
5 A" of Dziejma, which the Examiner relied upon in rejecting the claims, only Fig. 8 and  
6 Appendix A find explicit support in the '590 Provisional.

7

8

---

9 In the last half of page 14 of the Second Appeal Brief, Appellant re-presented certain  
10 arguments and noted that the Examiner did not address these arguments in the Fifth Office  
11 Action. The Examiner's response to these arguments is found in the first full paragraph on page  
12 16 of the Examiner's Answer and is reproduced below:

13 The Examiner Respectfully Disagrees: The FVE (field validation engine, see abstract) of Dziejma  
14 represents a shell that describes several validation function calls encapsulated within the  
15 underlying HTML document (see appendix A). Function calls encapsulated within a validation  
16 shell of markup ('590 Provisional: see FVE code pg 4-8 teachings several functional calls  
17 encapsulated in a validation shell which is within the FVE Code).

18 The Examiner's response isn't to specifically identify the allegedly disclosing feature. Instead,  
19 the Examiner makes a blanket assertion that the field validation of Dziejma discloses the claimed  
20 limitation at issue and refers to Appendix A of Dziejma/pages 4-8 of the '590 Provisional. Such  
21 a blanket analysis is entirely deficient in properly characterizing the scope and content of the  
22 applied prior art.

24

25

---

1        In response to the arguments presented on pages 15-17 of the Second Appeal Brief, the  
2        Examiner initially asserted the following in the paragraph spanning pages 16 and 17 of the  
3        Examiner's Answer:

4              The Examiner Respectfully Disagrees: Dziejma paragraph 40 states "The described **form**  
5              **validation method may be also used on the server for performing server-side validation.** In  
6              that case the **form validation engine resides in the server** and the form with the embedded  
7              markers and data is submitted to the server either locally or via the network connection."  
8              (emphasis in original)  
9

10       Appellant is unclear as to the importance of this cited portion of paragraph [0040] of Dziejma.  
11       This passage describes that the form validation engine resides in the server alone or may reside  
12       in the server and be used in addition to client-side validation. Thus, Dziejma refers to two  
13       different form validation engines. Importantly, the whole of the Examiner's analysis relies upon  
14       the teachings within Dziejma associated with the form validation engine, which resides in the  
15       client. See page 5, line 7 and page 12, line 13 of the Examiner's Answer and page 3, line 16 of  
16       the Fifth Office Action, which all state "[f]urthermore all is done on the client device."

17  
18       By relying upon teachings of the form validation engine residing in the server, then the  
19       Examiner gives up the teachings of Dziejma associated with the form validation engine residing  
20       in the client, which is the subject of the claimed invention and the Examiner's analysis. Put  
21       differently, the Examiner cannot rely upon teachings associated with the form validation engine  
22       of Dziejma residing in the server to modify teachings associated with the separate form  
23       validation engine of Dziejma residing in the client.

24  
25       The Examiner further asserted the following in the remaining portion of the above-  
26       referenced paragraph:

27       Although Dziejma teaches the use of JavaScript in the FVE, he only shows function calls defined  
28       within the engine and fails to show reference to a separate library objects referenced by JavaScript.

1        However Sokolov explicitly teaches the use of libraries which are interfaced with JavaScript (see  
2        abstract). Thus at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to the skilled artisan to  
3        have modified the script definitions of Dziejma to include reference to various JavaScript libraries  
4        has taught by Sokolov to provide extensibility to the field validation engine of Dziejma.  
5

6        This passage, however, is nearly identical to the passage found in the paragraph spanning pages  
7        3 and 4 of the Fourth Office Action and reproduced on page 15 of the Second Appeal Brief,  
8        which Appellant has already addressed.

9  
10

---

  
11        In response to the arguments presented on pages 17 and 18 of the Second Appeal Brief,  
12        the Examiner asserted the following in the paragraph spanning pages 16 and 17 of the  
13        Examiner's Answer:

14        The Examiner Respectfully Disagrees: Appellant has once again failed to provide evidence to  
15        show which sections of the specification in detail define the term "**Pervasive** device", instead  
16        relying on his own opinion. The Examiner however provides the general definition of the term  
17        Pervasive to give the claim broadest reasonable interpretation.

18  
19        Google: Definition of : **Pervasive**: **Manifested throughout**; pervading, permeating, penetrating or  
20        affecting everything  
21

22        Thus the teachings of Dziejma have already established a client/server software architecture as  
23        that well known in the art. Since Dziejma supports both server side and client side validation as  
24        recited in paragraph 40 he describes a pervasive device (client device), since a client device is  
25        manifested throughout a typical distributed system. Furthermore since the access to the server  
26        from the users client machine shown in fig 1 and described in paragraph 22 is done accessing a  
27        URL, it would have been obvious for the skilled artisan to have used the client device  
28        (Specifically including a PDA/mobile device) to access a URL, since Sokolov deals with markup  
29        documents (see column 1, lines 55-67 of Sokolov).  
30

31        The Examiner's analysis includes multiple flaws. The Examiner's analysis, yet again, evidences  
32        a failure to recognize that the burden rests with the Examiner to establish a prima facie case of  
33        unpatentability. Before making a proper comparison between the claimed invention and the  
34        prior art, the language of the claims must first be properly construed.<sup>2</sup> With the exception of the

---

<sup>2</sup> See *In re Paulsen*, 30 F.3d 1475, 1479 (Fed. Cir. 1994); see also, *Panduit Corp. v. Dennison Mfg. Co.*, 810 F.2d 1561, 1567-68 (Fed. Cir. 1987) (In making a patentability determination, analysis must begin with the question, "what is the invention claimed?" since "[c]laim interpretation, . . . will normally control the remainder of the

1 Examiner's Answer, the Examiner had not yet attempted to construe a meaning for the term  
2 "pervasive device."

3

4 The Examiner's analysis is also flawed by construing a meaning for "pervasive" and not  
5 for "pervasive device," which was actually claimed and is a term of art. Specifically, reference is  
6 made to the "Background of the Invention" section of U.S. Patent No. 6,925,481, which states  
7 the following:

8 Pervasive devices (also referred to as "pervasive computing devices") have become  
9 popular in recent years as people increasingly seek "anywhere, anytime" access to services such as  
10 voice and data communications. Many pervasive devices are designed to be mobile, and may  
11 equivalently be referred to as "mobile devices" or "mobile computing devices". Examples of  
12 mobile pervasive devices range from two-way pagers to personal digital assistants, or "PDAs"  
13 (such as the Palm Pilot, Handspring Visor.TM., or Compaq iPAQ) to cellular phones (such as the  
14 Nokia 6110) to multi-function devices (such as the Nokia 9110 or Qualcomm "pdQ.TM."  
15 smartphone). ("Visor" is a trademark of Handspring, and "pdQ" is a trademark of QUALCOMM  
16 Incorporated.) All pervasive devices are not necessarily mobile, however. Examples of this latter  
17 category include smart appliances for the home or business setting, devices which are permanently  
18 mounted in automobiles, and so forth.

19 Pervasive devices typically share several common characteristics:  
20 1) limited processor speed;  
21 2) limited memory capacity;  
22 3) small size, which limits the richness of the data input and output interfaces (for  
example, small screen, limited keypad, and so forth);  
23 4) a limited amount of software pre-installed on the device; and  
24 5) access to limited-bandwidth networks.

25 Referring to paragraphs [0006] and [0007] of Appellant's disclosure, Appellant contrasted  
26 mobile device (i.e., an a pervasive device) with conventional computing clients. Although  
27 paragraph [0017] describes that the pattern validation system could be used for any type of  
28 device, the claimed "*lightweight* pattern validation system" is particularly useful in systems with  
29 limited processor speed, limited memory capacity, etc., which are characteristics of a pervasive  
30 device including, for example, cellular telephones and personal digital assistants.

---

31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
5510  
5511  
5512  
5513  
5514  
5515  
5516  
5517  
5518  
5519  
5520  
5521  
5522  
5523  
5524  
5525  
5526  
5527  
5528  
5529  
5530  
5531  
5532  
5533  
5534  
5535  
5536  
5537  
5538  
5539  
55310  
55311  
55312  
55313  
55314  
55315  
55316  
55317  
55318  
55319  
55320  
55321  
55322  
55323  
55324  
55325  
55326  
55327  
55328  
55329  
55330  
55331  
55332  
55333  
55334  
55335  
55336  
55337  
55338  
55339  
55340  
55341  
55342  
55343  
55344  
55345  
55346  
55347  
55348  
55349  
55350  
55351  
55352  
55353  
55354  
55355  
55356  
55357  
55358  
55359  
55360  
55361  
55362  
55363  
55364  
55365  
55366  
55367  
55368  
55369  
55370  
55371  
55372  
55373  
55374  
55375  
55376  
55377  
55378  
55379  
55380  
55381  
55382  
55383  
55384  
55385  
55386  
55387  
55388  
55389  
55390  
55391  
55392  
55393  
55394  
55395  
55396  
55397  
55398  
55399  
553100  
553101  
553102  
553103  
553104  
553105  
553106  
553107  
553108  
553109  
553110  
553111  
553112  
553113  
553114  
553115  
553116  
553117  
553118  
553119  
553120  
553121  
553122  
553123  
553124  
553125  
553126  
553127  
553128  
553129  
553130  
553131  
553132  
553133  
553134  
553135  
553136  
553137  
553138  
553139  
553140  
553141  
553142  
553143  
553144  
553145  
553146  
553147  
553148  
553149  
553150  
553151  
553152  
553153  
553154  
553155  
553156  
553157  
553158  
553159  
553160  
553161  
553162  
553163  
553164  
553165  
553166  
553167  
553168  
553169  
553170  
553171  
553172  
553173  
553174  
553175  
553176  
553177  
553178  
553179  
553180  
553181  
553182  
553183  
553184  
553185  
553186  
553187  
553188  
553189  
553190  
553191  
553192  
553193  
553194  
553195  
553196  
553197  
553198  
553199  
553200  
553201  
553202  
553203  
553204  
553205  
553206  
553207  
553208  
553209  
553210  
553211  
553212  
553213  
553214  
553215  
553216  
553217  
553218  
553219  
553220  
553221  
553222  
553223  
553224  
553225  
553226  
553227  
553228  
553229  
553230  
553231  
553232  
553233  
553234  
553235  
553236  
553237  
553238  
553239  
553240  
553241  
553242  
553243  
553244  
553245  
553246  
553247  
553248  
553249  
553250  
553251  
553252  
553253  
553254  
553255  
553256  
553257  
553258  
553259  
553260  
553261  
553262  
553263  
553264  
553265  
553266  
553267  
553268  
553269  
553270  
553271  
553272  
553273  
553274  
553275  
553276  
553277  
553278  
553279  
553280  
553281  
553282  
553283  
553284  
553285  
553286  
553287  
553288  
553289  
553290  
553291  
553292  
553293  
553294  
553295  
553296  
553297  
553298  
553299  
553300  
553301  
553302  
553303  
553304  
553305  
553306  
553307  
553308  
553309  
553310  
553311  
553312  
553313  
553314  
553315  
553316  
553317  
553318  
553319  
553320  
553321  
553322  
553323  
553324  
553325  
553326  
553327  
553328  
553329  
553330  
553331  
553332  
553333  
553334  
553335  
553336  
553337  
553338  
553339  
553340  
553341  
553342  
553343  
553344  
553345  
553346  
553347  
553348  
553349  
553350  
553351  
553352  
553353  
553354  
553355  
553356  
553357  
553358  
553359  
553360  
553361  
553362  
553363  
553364  
553365  
553366  
553367  
553368  
553369  
553370  
553371  
553372  
553373  
553374  
553375  
553376  
553377  
553378  
553379  
553380  
553381  
553382  
553383  
553384  
553385  
553386  
553387  
553388  
553389  
553390  
553391  
553392  
553393  
553394  
553395  
553396  
553397  
553398  
553399  
553400  
553401  
553402  
553403  
553404  
553405  
553406  
553407  
553408  
553409  
553410  
553411  
553412  
553413  
553414  
553415  
553416  
553417  
553418  
553419  
553420  
553421  
553422  
553423  
553424  
553425  
553426  
553427  
553428  
553429  
553430  
553431  
553432  
553433  
553434  
553435  
553436  
553437  
553438  
553439  
553440  
553441  
553442  
553443  
553444  
553445  
553446  
553447  
553448  
553449  
553450  
553451  
553452  
553453  
553454  
553455  
553456  
553457  
553458  
553459  
553460  
553461  
553462  
553463  
553464  
553465  
553466  
553467  
553468  
553469  
553470  
553471  
553472  
553473  
553474  
553475  
553476  
553477  
553478  
553479  
553480  
553481  
553482  
553483  
553484  
553485  
553486  
553487  
553488  
553489  
553490  
553491  
553492  
553493  
553494  
553495  
553496  
553497  
553498  
553499  
553500  
553501  
553502  
553503  
553504  
553505  
553506  
553507  
553508  
553509  
553510  
553511  
553512  
553513  
553514  
553515  
553516  
553517  
553518  
553519  
553520  
553521  
553522  
553523  
553524  
553525  
553526  
553527  
553528  
553529  
553530  
553531  
553532  
553533  
553534  
553535  
553536  
553537  
553538  
553539  
553540  
553541  
553542  
553543  
553544  
553545  
553546  
553547  
553548  
553549  
553550  
553551  
553552  
553553  
553554  
553555  
553556  
553557  
553558  
553559  
553560  
553561  
553562  
553563  
553564  
553565  
553566  
553567  
553568  
553569  
553570  
553571  
553572  
553573  
553574  
553575  
553576  
553577  
553578  
553579  
553580  
553581  
553582  
553583  
553584  
553585  
553586  
553587  
553588  
553589  
553590  
553591  
553592  
553593  
553594  
553595  
553596  
553597  
553598  
553599  
553600  
553601  
553602  
553603  
553604  
553605  
553606  
553607  
553608  
553609  
553610  
553611  
553612  
553613  
553614  
553615  
553616  
553617  
553618  
553619  
553620  
553621  
553622  
553623  
553624  
553625  
553626  
553627  
553628  
553629  
553630  
553631  
553632  
553633  
553634  
553635  
553636  
553637  
553638  
553639  
553640  
553641  
553642  
553643  
553644  
553645  
553646  
553647  
553648  
553649  
553650  
553651  
553652  
553653  
553654  
553655  
553656  
553657  
553658  
553659  
553660  
553661  
553662  
553663  
553664  
553665  
553666  
553667  
553668  
553669  
553670  
553671  
553672  
553673  
553674  
553675  
553676  
553677  
553678  
553679  
553680  
553681  
553682  
553683  
553684  
553685  
553686  
553687  
553688  
553689  
553690  
553691  
553692  
553693  
553694  
553695  
553696  
553697  
553698  
553699  
553700  
553701  
553702  
553703  
553704  
553705  
553706  
553707  
553708  
553709  
553710  
553711  
553712  
553713  
553714  
553715  
553716  
553717  
553718  
553719  
553720  
553721  
553722  
553723  
553724  
553725  
553726  
553727  
553728  
553729  
553730  
553731  
553732  
553733  
553734  
553735  
553736  
553737  
553738  
553739  
5537340  
5537341  
5537342  
5537343  
5537344  
5537345  
5537346  
5537347  
5537348  
5537349  
5537350  
5537351  
5537352  
5537353  
5537354  
5537355  
5537356  
5537357  
5537358  
5537359  
55373510  
55373511  
55373512  
55373513  
55373514  
55373515  
55373516  
55373517  
55373518  
55373519  
55373520  
55373521  
55373522  
55373523  
55373524  
55373525  
55373526  
55373527  
55373528  
55373529  
55373530  
55373531  
55373532  
55373533  
55373534  
55373535  
55373536  
55373537  
55373538  
55373539  
55373540  
55373541  
55373542  
55373543  
55373544  
55373545  
55373546  
55373547  
55373548  
55373549  
55373550  
55373551  
55373552  
55373553  
55373554  
55373555  
55373556  
55373557  
55373558  
55373559  
55373560  
55373561  
55373562  
55373563  
55373564  
55373565  
55373566  
55373567  
55373568  
55373569  
55373570  
55373571  
55373572  
55373573  
55373574  
55373575  
55373576  
55373577  
55373578  
55373579  
55373580  
55373581  
55373582  
55373583  
55373584  
55373585  
55373586  
55373587  
55373588  
55373589  
55373590  
55373591  
55373592  
55373593  
55373594  
55373595  
55373596  
55373597  
55373598  
55373599  
553735100  
553735101  
553735102  
553735103  
553735104  
553735105  
553735106  
553735107  
553735108  
553735109  
553735110  
553735111  
553735112  
553735113  
553735114  
553735115  
553735116  
553735117  
553735118  
553735119  
553735120  
553735121  
553735122  
553735123  
553735124  
553735125  
553735126  
553735127  
553735128  
553735129  
553735130  
553735131  
553735132  
553735133  
553735134  
553735135  
553735136  
553735137  
553735138  
553735139  
553735140  
553735141  
553735142  
553735143  
553735144  
553735145  
553735146  
553735147  
553735148  
553735149  
553735150  
553735151  
553735152  
553735153  
553735154  
553735155  
553735156  
553735157  
553735158  
553735159  
553735160  
553735161  
553735162  
553735163  
553735164  
553735165  
553735166  
553735167  
553735168  
553735169  
553735170  
553735171  
553735172  
553735173  
553735174  
553735175  
553735176  
553735177  
553735178  
553735179  
553735180  
553735181  
553735182  
553735183  
553735184  
553735185  
553735186  
553735187  
553735188  
553735189  
553735190  
553735191  
553735192  
553735193  
553735194  
553735195  
553735196  
553735197  
553735198  
553735199  
553735200  
553735201  
553735202  
553735203  
553735204  
553735205  
553735206  
553735207  
553735208  
553735209  
553735210  
553735211  
553735212  
553735213  
553735214  
553735215  
553735216  
553735217  
553735218  
553735219  
553735220  
553735221  
553735222  
553735223  
553735224  
553735225  
553735226  
553735227  
553735228  
553735229  
553735230  
553735231  
553735232  
553735233  
553735234  
553735235  
553735236  
553735237  
553735238  
553735239  
553735240  
553735241  
553735242  
553735243  
553735244  
553735245  
553735246  
553735247  
553735248  
553735249  
553735250  
553735251  
553735252  
553735253  
553735254  
553735255  
553735256  
553735257  
553735258  
553735259  
553735260  
553735261  
553735262  
553735263  
553735264  
553735265  
553735266  
553735267  
553735268  
553735269  
553735270  
553735271  
553735272  
553735273  
55373527

1        Thus, based upon the broadest reasonable interpretation that one having ordinary skill in  
2    the art would reach, the teaching of a generic "client device" by Dziejma, as alleged by the  
3    Examiner, does not correspond to the claimed "pervasive device." Although the Examiner refers  
4    to teachings within Sokolov, the Examiner did not rely upon Sokolov in the statement of the  
5    rejection as to claim 15 (see page 9 of the Examiner's Answer).

6

For the reasons set forth in the Second Appeal Brief and for those set forth herein, Appellant respectfully solicits the Honorable Board to reverse the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 103.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 09-0461, and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Date: September 22, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott D. Paul/

Scott D. Paul  
Registration No. 42,984  
Steven M. Greenberg  
Registration No. 44,725  
Phone: (561) 922-3845  
CUSTOMER NUMBER 46320